

history. They would have had to have been somebody who is employed in the United States, has been employed satisfactorily, good recommendations by the employers, and then no felony convictions or any other major record of criminal activity or history.

So this would satisfy the argument that these people have come into this country illegally, remained here, and have gained a legal status. They would have to return to their country of origin.

So it establishes a new W visa for those who are classified as undocumented workers but have gone through these steps and stages at the present time.

Congressman PENCE has also introduced legislation which calls for illegal immigrants to leave the United States, report to centers located outside the country before reentering the country with a guest worker visa, which is somewhat similar to what I am talking about here. So this is not necessarily a novel or new idea, and many people have taken a look at it.

The requirement for all illegal immigrants to leave the United States and enter into the U.S. legally with a W visa may serve as a way to create common ground between the House and the Senate bills.

□ 1800

It is important that an immigration bill pass this year. I think the American people are expecting it and hope it will happen. Yet we are so far apart in the two bodies that this may be difficult to effect.

So H.R. 4065 may serve as a catalyst to compromise and final passage. I would like to have my colleagues at least give it some consideration because we will have to think outside the box a little bit. I think it will take some innovative solutions to this problem. It is something that again is something that is really important for this body to accomplish before the end of this session.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 861, DECLARING THAT THE UNITED STATES WILL PREVAIL IN THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-502) on the resolution (H. Res. 868) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 861) declaring that the United States will prevail in the Global War on Terror, the struggle to protect freedom from the terrorist adversary, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FLOOR DEBATE ON GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, a remarkable document showed up in our mailboxes this afternoon. It is called a "Confidential Messaging Memo" for the floor debate on Iraq and the global war on terror.

This is apparently a memo that Republican leadership provided to Members on their side so they would know how to go about rubber-stamping the President's every thought and deed and could do their best to make sure that we don't have the kind of debate that the American people deserve.

The American people deserve to have us talk about what is really going on in Iraq and how it does or does not make us safer. They deserve to have mistakes acknowledged and paths forward discussed honestly and frankly, admitting problems and working together to make things better.

They deserve a Congress that is more interested in their security than in scoring points for the November election.

According to the Republican leadership's tactical memo, this is precisely what the American people will not get. Instead, there will be confusion and intentional misdirection. There will be ad hominem attacks, and that means attacks on individuals, and attempts to make Saddam Hussein and 9/11 more or less the same thing, attempts to call Democrats' legitimate questions about the administration's rationale for war and conduct of the war into what, and I quote, "policies to concede defeat on the battlefield."

The memo is filled with advice on how to deflect, confuse, conflate and con. I would like to enter that memo into the RECORD so everyone will be able to read it and not be confused when they hear the debate begin tomorrow. They will know what the script is that the other side is following.

Mr. Speaker, let me read some portions now because I think we all have a right to know what Republicans are advising their Members to say and think.

"During this debate, our Republican Conference should be focused on delivering these key points:

"The Importance of Our Actions. It is imperative during this debate that we reexamine the conditions that required the United States to take military action in Afghanistan and Iraq in the aftermath of the attacks of September 11, 2001."

In other words, the Republicans are being told to continue the big lie that Iraq was behind 9/11 or had something to gain from 9/11, and it is all tied together in one neat package.

Secondly, the Republican leadership wants to make the point that they are smart and tough enough because they don't look back, they don't analyze, they don't admit errors, and they don't learn.

Now if they were a baseball pitcher who was this bad, Rumsfeld would have been jerked five innings ago. But, of course, our President ran the Rangers and gave Chicago Sammy Sosa, so we know his judgment in baseball.

Now to do anything else, according to their memo, is to be "prone to waiver endlessly" or "to abandon our efforts" against terrorism. It is as if the Republicans believe there is only one kind of effort against terrorism that has validity, and that any kind of thoughtful consideration of alternatives is a sign of cowardice and weakness.

"Republicans believe," the memo says, "victory in Iraq will be an important blow for terrorism." Yes, of course, it would be. But what is victory in Iraq and how do we get off the path we are on presently and onto that victory path?

We are forbidden to talk about those questions. It would be wrong for 435 fairly well-educated, loyal Americans, who have been sent here by their districts to help govern this country, to start raising questions about what we ought to do.

There will be one proposal with no amendments; that is it. It would be "weak" and "wavering" and a sign of "abandoning our efforts" if we attempt to make those efforts more rational and successful and relate them to the goal of making Americans safer.

We are in trouble in Iraq. We don't have a plan except to keep plowing ahead with the same old policy: a strategy that is getting Americans and Iraqis killed and driving Iraqis to despair and helplessness. We don't have a Congress that can step up and take responsibility and try to make the administration listen to reason.

The President's policy is to put the control of this in the hands of the Iraqis. When they stand up, we will stand down. Who is going to tell the Iraqis when to stand up? The clerics, of course. The Shiia and Sunni clerics will decide when they stand up. What if they don't tell them to stand up? We are there until it ends.

This is a charade. We will go through it tomorrow, but it will not shed any light on where we ought to be going as Americans.

And we don't have a Congress that can step up and take responsibility and try to make the administration listen to reason.

So the Republican leadership scheduled public relations time in the House in an effort to stop the Republican free fall in the polls.

Republican leaders cannot tell the American people what they intend to do except more of the same.